



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/874,010	06/06/2001	Shigeharu Nakagawa	P56332	7488

7590

08/19/2002

Robert E. Bushnell
Suite 300
1522 K Street, N. W.
Washington, DC 20005

EXAMINER

BROWN, TIMOTHY M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3625

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/874,010

Applicant(s)

NAKAGAWA, SHIGEHARU

Examiner

Tim Brown

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 October 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 1.5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 21 recites the limitation "said finalized document" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. **Claims 1, 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Farros et al. (US 5,930,810).**

Regarding claim 1, Farros et al. teach an Internet printing apparatus, comprising:
a home page that can be accessed by a customer over the World Wide Web,
said home page comprising instructions of how a customer can request a print job, said
home page further comprising a form that may be accessed through a hyperlink, said

Art Unit: 3625

form enabling a customer to request said print job (col. 2, lines 24-27 and 51-55; col. 4, lines 27-30; col. 7, lines 46-51 and 53-65; and col. 8, lines 15-17)

a first memory storing a customer's printing parameters and a first draft of said customer's print job (col. 5, lines 14-20);

an editor connected to said first memory to edit said first draft of said customer's print job creating a finalized version of said customer's print job (col. 8, lines 30-36 and 42-67);

a second memory connected to said editor storing said finalized version of said customer's print job (col. 11, lines 45-52); and

an output device connected to said second memory via network printing to download said finalized version onto a recording media at a location of said customer's choice (col. 2, lines 27-32).

Regarding claim 2, Farros et al. teach an apparatus wherein said customer's first draft and said finalized version of said customer's print job comprises text, images and pictures (col. 3, lines 66-67; col. 4, lines 1-10; and col. 8, lines 58-60).

Regarding claim 10, the examiner notes that the limitation "wherein said output device prints 180 sheets per minute" is functional claim language and carries little weight because it does not provide any physical limitation. Moreover, Farros et al. teach an output device that is reasonably capable of printing 180 sheets per minute (col. 2, lines 27-32).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claims 3-8, 11-13 and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farros et al. (US 5,930,810).**

Regarding claim 3, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 1 above. Farros et al. further teach an Internet printing apparatus wherein said printing parameters comprise: size of paper to be printed on (col. 4, lines 27-30; col. 8, lines 25-27; and col. 9, lines 4-6); color of paper to be printed on (col. 9, lines 2-4; and col. 10, lines 57-60) quality of paper to be printed on (col. 9, lines 4-6) and col. 10, lines 57-60); quantity to be printed (col. 10, lines 41-43); and type and location of output device (col. 10, lines 57-60; and col. 11, lines 14-19 and 54-61).

Farros et al. do not teach an Internet printing apparatus wherein said printing parameters comprise whether or not to print a finished cover page and whether or not to bind each document printed and a type of binding to be used. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that determining whether or not to include a cover page and the type of binding to be used for a print job is old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the system of Farros et al. to include accepting printing parameters comprising whether or not to print a finished cover page and whether or not to bind each

Art Unit: 3625

document printed and a type of binding to be used. This modification would permit the user to customize his print job and provide for a bound print product with pages collectively attached such that their order is maintained.

Regarding claims 4-7, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 1 above. Farros et al. do not teach an Internet printing apparatus further comprised of said output device being selected from the group consisting of a toner type digital printer, a CD-ROM printing device, an ink jet type printer and a magnetic optical disk read/write device. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that these output devices are old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. to include an output device selected from the group consisting of a toner type digital printer, a CD-ROM printing device, an ink jet type printer and a magnetic optical disk read/write device. Such a modification would provide at least two benefits. First, the user would be afforded a range of quality for his print job. Second, the user could select a format for his print job that is compatible with his personal system.

Regarding claim 8, Farros et al. teach an Internet printing apparatus wherein editing comprises changes made by said editor to said first draft submitted by said customer over said Internet to said first memory, said changes include changes specified by said customer and changes initiated by said editor (Abstract; and col. 8, lines 30-36 and 42-50).

Regarding claim 11, Farros et al. teach a method for printing text, images and pictures, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 3625

connecting, via the Internet, a customer at a computer terminal to a printing agency (Abstract; col. 2, lines 20-24, 42-46 and 65-67; col. 5, lines 9-20, 26-28; and 56-58; and col. 7, lines 6-11);

filling out a print request form by said customer and submitting said print request form over the Internet to said printing agency (col. 2, lines 24-30; col. 5, lines 3-5; and col. 7, lines 46-65);

transmitting a first draft of a customer's print job comprising text, images and pictures from said customer's computer to said printing agency over the Internet and storing said first draft in a first memory (col. 2, lines 27-32 and 65-67; and col. 5, lines 9-20 and 26-28) ;

editing said first draft of said customer's print job at said print agency and storing a resulting document in a second memory (col. 2, lines 25-30; and col. 10, lines 62-67); and

outputting said document from said second memory to a remote output device of the customer's choice (col. 2, lines 27-32).

Farros et al. do not teach receiving a cost estimate from said printing agency. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that receiving an online estimate for a service is old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. to include receiving a cost estimate from said printing agency because adding this step would permit the customer to compare printing agencies and select the printing agency with the lowest price.

Art Unit: 3625

Farros et al. do not teach editing said first draft of said customer's print job at said print agency. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that editing a customer's print job at a printing agency's location, by printing agency personnel, is old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. to include editing said first draft of said customer's print job at said print agency in order to provide editing by a second, independent party in order to identify and correct errors that may have been overlooked by the customer.

Regarding claim 12, a method of printing text, images and pictures wherein said request form asks the customer the quantity to be printed (col. 10, lines 41-43), a paper size (col. 4, lines 27-30; col. 8, lines 25-27; and col. 9, lines 4-6),

Farros et al. does not teach a method of printing text, images and pictures wherein said request form asks the customer a number of pages in said first draft, whether or not a cover is to be made, and whether or not each document is to be bound. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that determining these parameters, by a printing agency, in connection with a print job, is old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the teachings of Farros et al. to include asking the customer a number of pages in said first draft, whether or not a cover is to be made, and whether or not each document is to be bound. Asking the customer the number of pages in said first draft would enable the printing agency to determine a print job cost and ensure the accuracy of the customer's order. Asking the customer whether or not a

Art Unit: 3625

cover is to be made and whether or not each document is to be bound would further enable the customer to customize his print job and bind his print product.

Regarding claim 13, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 11 above. Farros et al. further teach a method for printing text, images and pictures wherein said request form further asks said customer the color and quality of the paper to be printed on (col. 9, lines 2-6) and the location of where the documents are to be printed out (col. 2, lines 27-32).

Farros et al. do not specifically teach a method for printing text, images and pictures wherein said request form further asks said customer the type of output device the documents are to be printed out on and the type of binding if any. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that having a printing agency request print product parameters, such as the type of print product binding and the type and/or quality of printed product media are old and well known in the art. For example, printing agency service forms have, for a long time, enabled a customer to indicate whether the customer would like his product printed as a slide show or overhead transparency. Another old and well known printing agency request is whether the customer would like a spiral or taped binding. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Farros et al. to include a service request form wherein the form further asks said customer the type of output device the documents are to be printed out on and the type of binding if any. This step would allow the customer to select a customized printed product that is most suited for his particular need.

Art Unit: 3625

Regarding claim 16, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 11 above. Farros et al. do not teach a method for printing text, images and pictures wherein said editing step is comprised of enlarging or reducing images and pictures of said first draft of said customer's print job. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that having a printing agency determine routine printing parameters such as whether a particular image is to be enlarged or reduced, so as to improve the fit of the image on a document, is old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. to include an editing step comprising enlarging or reducing images and pictures of said first draft of said customer's print job in order to produce the customer's printed product with images included. For example, a photograph of a customer may require reducing in order for it to appear on a printed business card.

Regarding claim 17, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 11 above. Farros et al. do not teach a method for printing text, images and pictures wherein said editing step is comprised of:

- conducting a first editing by said printing agency of said first draft of said customer's print job;
- sending said edited first draft of said customer's print job back to the customer over the Internet;
- conducting a further revisions to said print job by said customer; sending said revised print job back to the printing agency;

- conducting a second editing by said printing agency to said revised print job to produce a finalized document; and
- storing said finalized document in said second memory at said printing agency.

However, the examiner takes Official Notice that having a printing agency and a customer concurrently edit and revise a draft of a printed product is old and well known in the printing art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. to include an editing step comprising conducting a first editing by said printing agency of said first draft of said customer's print job, sending said edited first draft of said customer's print job back to the customer over the Internet, conducting a further revisions to said print job by said customer, sending said revised print job back to the printing agency, conducting a second editing by said printing agency to said revised print job to produce a finalized document, and storing said finalized document in said second memory at said printing agency. The addition of these steps would permit a revision of the customer's print job draft thereby ensuring a quality print job and satisfaction of the customer's particular needs.

Regarding claim 18, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 18 above. Farros et al. do not teach a method for printing text, images and pictures wherein said output device can be a toner type digital printer, a CD-ROM printing device, an ink jet printer or a magnetic optical disk read/write device. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that these output devices are old and well known in the art and are commonly used in connection with a personal computer. Farros et al.

Art Unit: 3625

suggest combining its method with these output devices in that Farros et al. disclose that its method can be implemented using a personal computer with Internet access (col. 2, lines 42-46). Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. to include output device comprising a toner type digital printer, a CD-ROM printing device, an ink jet printer or a magnetic optical disk read/write device.

9. Claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chabrow (Chabrow, E. "iPrint: Self-Service Printing," InformationWeek, (December 13, 1999)) in view of Farros et al. (US 5,930,810).

Regarding claim 20, Chabrow teaches a system for printing a document having text, images and pictures, comprising:

a user computer terminal connected to the Internet (page 1, paragraph 1)¹;

a printing agency accessible via the Internet by said user computer (page 1, paragraph 1).

Chabrow does not teach an editor connected to said printing agency for editing a manuscript submitted by said user to said printing agency to produce said document having text, images and pictures. However, Farros et al. teach a system for ordering a printed product wherein the attributes of a saved print job are altered electronically (col. 8, lines 42-67). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Chabrow to include the teachings of Farros et al.

¹ Chabrow inherently teaches a user computer terminal connected to the Internet. Chabrow discloses having a user access a Website to design a printed product (page 1, paragraphs 1-3). Because accessing a Website requires the implementation of a computer, Chabrow inherently teaches a user computer terminal connected to the Internet.

Art Unit: 3625

because an editor connected to said printing agency for editing a manuscript submitted by said user to said printing agency to produce said document having text, images and pictures would provide a means for correcting customer errors prior to transmitting and printing the customer's document.

Chabrow further teaches a first plurality of output devices located at a second plurality of locations distant from said printing agency, each of said first plurality of output devices connected to said printing agency via computer network printing (page 1, paragraphs 3 and 8).

Regarding claim 21, Chabrow and Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 20 above. Chabrow does not teach a system for printing a document having text, images and pictures wherein said printing agency comprises: a first memory for storing a manuscript originally submitted by said user prior to editing; and a second memory for storing said finalized document after editing. However, Farros et al. teach creating an electronic file for a draft of a print product and saving a finalized version of the print product on a second storage medium (col. 5, lines 9-20; and col. 11, lines 45-52). At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Chabrow to include the teachings of Farros et al.. A first memory for storing a manuscript originally submitted by said user prior to editing would permit a user to return to a previous print job to make revisions. A second memory for storing said finalized document after editing would provide a means for transmitting the finalized document to the printing agency thereby making it possible to

Art Unit: 3625

process the order on multiple occasions without requiring the user to resubmit a product order.

Regarding claim 22, Chabrow further teaches a system for printing a document having text, images and pictures wherein a second plurality of users are transmitting and receiving data and revisions of a plurality of manuscripts simultaneously from said printing agency (page 1, paragraph 3).

Regarding claim 23, Chabrow and Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 20 above. Chabrow and Farros et al. do not teach a system for printing a document having text, images and pictures wherein said first plurality of output devices comprise: toner type digital printers; CD-ROM printing devices; ink jet type printers; and magnetic optical disk read/write devices. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that these output devices are old and well known in the art and are commonly used in connection with a personal computer. Farros et al. suggest combining its system with an output device comprising a toner type digital printer, a CD-ROM printing device, an ink jet printer or a magnetic optical disk read/write device in that Farros et al. disclose that its method can be implemented using a personal computer with Internet access (col. 2, lines 42-46). Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Chabrow and Farros et al. to include output device comprising a toner type digital printer, a CD-ROM printing device, an ink jet printer or a magnetic optical disk read/write device.

Regarding claim 24, Chabrow and Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 20 above. Chabrow does not a system for printing a document having text,

Art Unit: 3625

images and pictures wherein said first plurality of output devices print at a rate of 180 sheets per minute. The examiner notes that the limitation "wherein said output device prints 180 sheets per minute" is functional claim language and carries little weight because it does not provide any physical limitation. Moreover, Farros et al. teach an output device that is reasonably capable of printing 180 sheets per minute (col. 2, lines 27-32). Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Chabrow to include the teachings of Farros et al. in order to obtain high volume output in order to decrease service lead time.

10. Claims 9, 14, 15 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farros et al. (US 5,930,810) in view of Chabrow (Chabrow, E. "iPrint: Self-Service Printing," InformationWeek, (December 13, 1999)).

Regarding claims 9 and 14, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claims 8 and 11 above. Farros et al. do not teach an Internet printing apparatus wherein editing comprises correcting misspellings, correcting typographical errors, and correcting unreadable characters due to different software computer programs and/or different font environment. However, Chabrow teaches a system for ordering print products via an Internet Website wherein users proofread print product orders before the orders are submitted (page 1, paragraph 3). Farros et al. suggest incorporating an editing step comprising correcting misspellings, correcting typographical errors, and correcting unreadable characters due to different software computer programs and different font environment in that Farros et al. disclose having a user perform a final verification of a print job order (col. 3, lines 10-14). Therefore, at the time of the

Art Unit: 3625

applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. to include the teachings of Chabrow. Not only is this combination suggested by Farros et al., but correcting misspellings, correcting typographical errors, and correcting unreadable characters due to different software computer programs and different font environment would avoid the printing of a erred print product and subsequent reworking.

Regarding claim 15, Farros et al. and Chabrow teach all the limitations discussed under claim 14 above. Farros et al. and Chabrow do not teach a method for printing text, images and pictures wherein said editing step is further comprised of formatting page margins, line spacing, font size, page numbering, line numbering, and paragraph numbering. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that these steps are typical editing steps and are old and well known in the art. Therefore, at the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. and Chabrow to include an editing step further comprising formatting page margins, line spacing, font size, page numbering, line numbering, and paragraph numbering in order to provide a printed product that satisfies the customer's requirements.

Regarding claim 19, Farros et al. teach all the limitations discussed under claim 11 above. Farros et al. further teach an output device located at a second location distant from said printing agency (Abstract; col. 10, lines 41-46), said output device being connected by network printing to said second memory of said printing agency that stores said document for output (col. 11, lines 7-11 and 45-52). Farros et al. do not

Art Unit: 3625

expressly teach a plurality of output devices located at a second plurality of locations distant from said printing agency. However, Chabrow teaches transmitting print orders to a plurality of commercial printers over the Internet. At the time of the applicant's invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify Farros et al. with the teachings of Chabrow because the addition of a plurality of output devices located at a second plurality of locations distant from said printing agency would enable the printing agency to select from a number of print service providers. This would allow the printing agency to select a print service provider that offers the lowest cost or the shortest lead time. This modification would also afford the printing agency a wider range of options for locating a print service provider that is capable of filling specialized or high-volume orders.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Archibald (US 5,459,826) 17 October 1995; system and method for preparing text and pictorial materials for printing using predetermined coding and merging regimen
- b. Ross et al. (US 6,026,417) 15 February 2000; desktop publishing software for automatically changing the layout of content-filled documents
- c. Sparks et al. (US 6,167,382) 26 December 2000; design and production of print advertising and commercial display materials over the Internet

Art Unit: 3625

- d. Spector (US 5,870,718) 9 February 1999; computer-printer terminal for producing composite greeting and gift card
- e. Cannon et al. (US 5,748,484) 5 May 1998; system for printing social expression cards in response to electronically submitted orders
- f. Klatt et al. (US 6,415,277) 2 July 2002; method of generating print production tasks using information extracted from databases
- g. Shiota et al. (US 6,192,184) 20 February 2001; picture print generating method and system
- h. Funk et al. (US 5,937,162) 10 August 1999; method and apparatus for high volume e-mail delivery
- i. Funk (US 5,793,497) 11 August 1998; method and apparatus for delivering and modifying information electronically
- j. "iPrint.com Enters Pet Merchandise Market With iPrint.com Pet Shop; Online Print Shop Forms Alliance with Petstore.com," Business Wire (December 13, 1999)
- k. "Mustang Software Wins iPrint.com Contract; iPrint.com Upgrades to Internet Message Center Enterprise Edition to Manage Customer Interaction via E-mail," (July 20, 1999)
- l. "iPrint.com Wins Print Innovation Award," Business Wire (May 11, 1999)
- m. "iPrint, inc. Technology to Power Sir Speedy Online Print Shop," Business Wire (October 19, 1998)

Art Unit: 3625

- n. "OfficeMax and iPrint to Offer Online Printing Service," PR Newswire (February 17, 1998)
- o. iPrint.com [retrieved July 29, 2002]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: webarchive.org/web/19970413041134/www.iprint.com/cgi-shl/index.cgi>
- p. iPrint.com [retrieved July 29, 2002]. Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: webarchive.org/web/19970413041134/www.iprint.com/>
- q. Waybackmachine Internet Archive [retrieved July 29, 2002] Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: www.archive.org>
- r. Waybackmachine Internet Archive [retrieved July 29, 2002] Retrieved from the Internet: <URL: www.archive.org/web/*/www.iprint.com>

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tim Brown whose telephone number is (703) 305-1912. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on (703) 308-1344. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.


Application/Control Number: 09/874,010

Page 19

Art Unit: 3625

Tim Brown
Examiner
Art Unit 3625

tb
August 1, 2002


JEFFREY A. SMITH
PRIMARY EXAMINER